REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **May 23, 2003,** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-24. Claims 1, 4-5, 7-9, 12-13, 15-17, 20-21 and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maier et al (USPN 5,625,815, hereinafter "Maier") in view of Green et al (USPN 6,041,310, hereinafter "Green"). Claims 2-3, 6, 10-11, 14, 18-19, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maier in view of Green and further in view of Cochrane et al. (USPN 5,987,455, hereinafter "Cochrane").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent claims 1, 9, and 17 were rejected as being unpatentable over Maier in view of Green.

Applicant respectfully points out that Maier teaches a transaction manager that creates audit entries for each transaction to achieve higher database availability during structural changes, wherein a "transaction" refers to a structural change operation including a Move Partition procedure, a Split Partition procedure, a Move Partition Boundary procedure, and a Create Index procedure (see Maier, col. 1, lines 53-56, col. 2, lines 34-46). Note that these audit records are generated automatically **without consideration of the values** that appear in data that is audited.

In contrast, the present invention discloses **selectively** creating an audit record for accesses to a relational database (see page 3, lines 10-14 of the instant application). Specifically, the present invention teaches creating audit records for rows that are accessed by queries that satisfy certain auditing conditions. Hence, generation of an audit record can **depend on the value** of a certain field in a row in the database. For example, the present invention can generate audit records only for employee records with salary values greater than $100,000.

While Maier teaches creating an audit entry, generation of the audit entry in Maier's invention does **not depend on actual values** in the database. The present invention, on the contrary, teaches creating audit records to selectively record data based on the values of data being accessed. Hence, Maier's invention and the present invention teach performing different tasks and serve different purposes.

8

Neither Maier nor Green, either separately or in concert, suggests or implies **selectively** auditing user accesses to a relational database **based on the values of data being accessed**.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended Independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to clarify that the present invention creates an audit record for rows **based on a value in a field of a row**. These amendments find support on page 3, lines 10-14 and page 8, lines 5-15 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, and 17 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-8, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-16, which depend upon claim 9, and claims 18-24, which depend upon claim 17, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
A. Richard Park
Registration No. 41,241

Date: August 14, 2003

PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665